

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
JUN 15 2007

006/009

Appl. No. 10/782,259
Reply to Notice of Non-Responsive Amendment dated May 25, 2007

REMARKS

The Office Action dated December 14, 2006 indicated that Claims 6-8, 21, 22 and 38-53 were pending in the application and 40-53 were withdrawn from consideration.

On March 9, 2007, Applicants submitted an amendment in response to the December 14, 2006 Office Action, amending Claims 6-8, 21 and 22; canceling claims 40-53; and adding claims 54-66.

The Notice of Non-responsive Amendment dated May 25, 2007 states that the amended claims and the newly added claims are directed to a non-elected invention.

Claims 6-8, 21, 22, 38, 39 and 54-66 are canceled. Claims 67-86 are newly added. Reconsideration and allowance of Claims 67-86 are respectfully requested.

Notice of Non-Responsive Amendment

Claims 67-73 are newly added to recite "sealant region" in their preambles and features recited in Claims 6-8, 21, 22, 38 and 39, respectively. No new matter is added.

Since Claims 67-73 are directed to the elected invention, withdrawal of the Notice of Non-responsive Amendment is respectfully requested.

Claims 74-86 are directed to the display device, which was withdrawn from consideration by the Examiner. Claim 74 is dependent on elected claim 67, and claims 75-86 are dependent on claim 74. Upon allowance of claim 67, Applicant respectfully requests rejoinder and allowance of claims 74-86.

Claim Objections

The December 14, 2006 Office Action objects to Claims 38 and 39 for the informalities of the claim preamble. Since Claims 38 and 39 are canceled, withdrawal of the objections to Claims 38 and 39 is respectfully requested.

Appl. No. 10/782,259

Reply to Notice of Non-Responsive Amendment dated May 25, 2007

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

The December 14, 2006 Office Action rejects Claims 6-8, 21, 22, 37 and 38 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) for allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,587,589 to So et al. ("So"). Since Claim 37 was canceled in the Amendment in response to the Office Action dated January 25, 2005, Applicants submit that it is Claim 39, instead of Claim 37, that is rejected under §102(b). Since Claims 6-8, 21, 22, 38 and 39 are canceled, the rejections of Claims 6-8, 21, 22, 38 and 39 are thus moot.

Claim 67 recites "... a first material layer formed over one or more layers of material disposed over a first substrate having a pixel within a display region, the first material layer extending from the display region to a sealant region . . ." (Emphasis added).

So discloses a two-dimensional array of organic light emitting diodes (LEDs). In its FIG. 2, So shows a cross-sectional view of a single LED 20. (Col. 3, Lines 18-20). LED 20 includes substrate 21 upon which light transmissive layer 22, i.e., an electrode, is formed. Dielectric layer 24 (referred to as the first material layer recited in Claim 67) is formed over light transmissive layer 22. Electroluminescent medium 25 is formed within the cavity of dielectric layer 24. Metal layer 27, i.e., another electrode, is formed over the electroluminescent medium 25. (Col. 3, Lines 21-57). In short, single LED 20, i.e., a pixel, has a stacked structure including: light transmissive layer 22, electroluminescent medium 25 and metal layer 27. Clearly, dielectric layer 24 is horizontally adjacent to single LED 20 formed within the cavity and covered by metal electroluminescent medium 25 and metal layer 27. Accordingly, dielectric layer 24 is **NOT** formed over one or more layers of material which from a pixel within a display region.

Further, nothing in So's description or drawings show that parallel openings expose a surface of the one or more layers of material, that a sealant is disposed over and contacts the first material layer and is disposed within the openings and contacts the exposed surface of the one or more layers of material, that the sealant seals the sealant region between the first and second substrates and that the sealant has substantially flat contact surfaces with the first material layer and the exposed surface of the one or more layers of material. Accordingly, So fails to teach or suggest these features recited in the amended Claim 67. Thus, Claim 67 is not anticipated by So, and Claim 67 is therefore allowable for at least the reasons set forth above.

Appl. No. 10/782,259
Reply to Notice of Non-Responsive Amendment dated May 25, 2007

Claims 68-73 depend from Claim 67 and are therefore allowable via virtue of their dependencies.

Based on the foregoing, allowance of Claims 67-73 is respectfully requested.

Claims 74-86

Claims 74-86 are newly added. Support for Claims 74-86 can be found at, for example, paragraphs [0021]-[0027] and FIGS. 4a-4c, 5 and 6a-6c. No new matter is added.

As set forth above, Claims 74-86 depend from elected claim 67. Upon allowance of claim 67, Applicant respectfully requests rejoinder and allowance of claims 74-86.

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
JUN 15 2007

009/009

Appl. No. 10/782,259

Reply to Notice of Non-Responsive Amendment dated May 25, 2007

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant submits that this application is in condition for allowance. Early notification to that effect is respectfully requested.

The Assistant Commissioner for Patents is hereby authorized to charge any fees or credit any excess payment that may associated with this communication, to Deposit Account 04-1679.

Respectfully submitted,



Mark J. Marcell, Reg. No. 36,593
Attorney for Applicants

Dated: June 15, 2007

DUANE MORRIS LLP
101 West Broadway, Suite 900
San Diego, CA 92101
Telephone: (619) 744-2200
Facsimile: (619) 744-2201